



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

American School
of Classical Studies
in Rome

CERTAIN SOURCES OF CORRUPTION IN LATIN
MANUSCRIPTS :

A STUDY BASED UPON TWO MANUSCRIPTS OF LIVY: CODEX
PUTEANUS (FIFTH CENTURY), AND ITS COPY CODEX REGI-
NENSIS 762 (NINTH CENTURY)¹

XI. ERRORS OF CONSCIOUS EMENDATION

The errors illustrated in the foregoing chapters were made for the most part unconsciously, and were the result either of wrong visualization or of the ignorance of the scribe. They show no attempt at deliberate alteration of the text, with the exception of the occasional omission of elements which the scribe did not understand. Examples of more or less conscious emendation on the part of these ninth-century scribes are, however, not wanting. As I have already said in the Introduction, there was no such wholesale tampering with the text as is to be found in manuscripts of the fifteenth century, which were not infrequently copied by scholars of the Renaissance, whose main aim was to produce a readable text. Lack of scholarship and a far from perfect knowledge of Latin prevented the scribes of R from undertaking any such systematic attempt at emendation; but the examples I shall give at the end of this chapter will show, I think, that Lindsay² underestimates considerably the extent of text alterations in ninth-century manuscripts when he says that the monk copyists confined their emendation to matters of punctuation and spelling. There are, of course, in R no deliberate interpo-

¹ Continued from p. 197.

² *Latin Textual Emendation*, p. 12.

lations of whole phrases or clauses, and no lengthy omissions; but conscious substitutions of one word for another, and alterations in the forms of individual words, are not at all uncommon. Such emendations are not of a critical nature, and almost all of them are entirely superficial in character. They are made, for the most part, without any careful study of the passage, or even of the sentence, in which they occur. In many of the passages so emended the text of P was perfectly correct, and the scribe's fancy suggested alterations which might, indeed, suit a particular part of a sentence, but which even the scribe himself would have recognized as nonsense, had he taken the trouble to read the passage over again. These emendations, made in the haste of copying, and due for the most part to the failure on the part of the scribe to understand the passages in which they occur, are, fortunately, not extensive, being confined to a single word, or to two words, at the most. The majority of them would still afford a clue for the reconstruction of the original reading, even if P had been lost.

During the time in which the scribes of R were engaged upon their copy, their work was supervised by one or more correctors, as is shown by the fact that errors which occur in the first quaternion of a scribe's work are frequently not repeated in the second. These correctors have also made slight emendations in many cases; but inasmuch as their corrections are of the same superficial nature as those of the scribes, I shall, for the sake of avoiding confusion, confine myself, in the present chapter, to the emendations which occur in the work of the scribes. Examples of the emendations of the correctors will be found in the next chapter.

Before proceeding to classify these errors of emendation, I shall first give a few examples of a general nature. XXIII, 40, 8 *caralis peruenturus erat ni manlius* obuio exercitu ab effusa eum populatione continuisset P. Here the scribe of R wrote *mannilius* for *ni manlius*, though he afterwards corrects the error. — XXV, 16, 5 *et iam altero anno* in magistratu erat P; *anno* was first written by the scribe of R, and then

changed to *hanno*, the word being regarded as a proper name.—XXV, 40, 4 *dispar ut causa earum ita condicio erat* P, *contio* R.—XXVI, 3, 5 *praeterquam quod omnibus probis onerabatur* P; in R the meaning is entirely changed by the writing of *probis honorabatur*.—XXVII, 42, 12 *consul ubi silentium in castris . . . cernebat* P, emended in R to *consulibus silentium*, etc.—XXVIII, 28, 7 *ubi si uos decedens confecta prouincia imperator relinquerem* P, *docendos* R.—XXVIII, 33, 15. Here the reading of P² is: *hispanorum cum neque pedes equiti neque eques pediti auxilio esset*. The scribe of R has written *neque acies peditia auxilio esset*.—XXVIII, 1, 13 *nihil enim paruum*, sed *carthaginis iam excidia agitabat animo* P. The scribe of R has written *eum* instead of *paruum*.—XXVIII, 37, 12 *cum in leges iurasset c. claudius et in aerarium escensisset* P. The words in italics were emended by the scribe of R to *et in aerarium es cecisset*. He seems to have supposed that the words had something to do with the hiding of money. The error may, however, be due to mental pronunciation.

These examples will suffice to show that the scribes did not confine themselves merely to alterations of spelling or punctuation, but have really tampered with the text. The superficial character of their emendations is apparent in each example. None of these passages present any difficulty whatever, and the text of P was perfectly correct. In the following list I shall give a few examples to illustrate the treatment of passages which were really corrupt.

XXIII, 42, 10 *nunc propraetoris unius et parui ad tuendam Nola praesidi praeda sumus* (*Luchs*). Here P has *propri* for *propraetoris*, an error arising out of the abbreviation *prop̄r̄*. This the scribe of R has emended to *proprii*, without any further attempt at making sense out of the passage.—XXVIII, 29, 2 *qui dolor quae ira incitavit?* (*Luchs*). This is corrupted in P to *qui doleraeuitae*. The scribe Ansoaldus has emended to *qui dolere uitae*, without any regard for sense, satisfied with having merely made Latin words.—XXVIII, 17, 8 *Carthaginiensibus iniurias tanto minores acciperemus* (*Luchs*). The

reading of P is *manto minores*. This the scribe of R has emended to *mantonino res*. — XXVI, 51, 9 his ita incohatis refectisque *quae quassata erant* (*Luchs*). The reading of P¹ is *qua quassauerant* (*qua* deleted by P²). The passage is emended by the scribe Theodegrimñ to: refectisque *aquas sauerant*.

On the whole, passages in P involving corruptions are either left as they were or, if altered, are dealt with in the manner of the above examples, where the scribes' sole aim seems to have been to make Latin words, and the sense does not apparently concern them at all. Small errors, involving spelling or the change of a single letter, are sometimes intelligently corrected, as, for instance, in XXIII, 35, 15 the correction of *ut tante* to *ut ante*; XXII, 20, 7 *periectas* to *perlectas*; XXII, 15, 8 *secutos* to *secutus*; XXVIII, 32, 1 *terfidiam* to *perfidiam*; XXIII, 48, 2 *ubique* to *ibique*; and XXVIII, 38, 5, where, for *consul comitiis perfectis* ad exercitum in Etruriam redit, P has *consul comitiis praefectis*, which is emended in R to *consul comitiis praefectus*, a correction which, though not right, at least displays some intelligence. But in the majority of cases where the scribes have made alterations it has been with the result of corrupting the text of Livy where it was correct, or of magnifying the error where it was corrupt. Fortunately, all of the emendations are on a small scale. The most common forms of errors of emendation which occur in this manuscript may be classified as follows:

(1) Alteration of the cases of adjectives and nouns. The scribes often altered one of two adjacent words in different cases to make it agree in case with the other, misled by the juxtaposition of the two words into supposing that they were related. Alterations of this kind are sometimes due to the unconscious repetition of the ending, but the majority are probably due to deliberate change. The scribe Ansoaldus was especially prone to superficial emendations of this nature.

Examples: XXVI, 25, 3 *uastatis proximis illyrici* in *pelagoniam* . . . uertit iter P, *illyricis* R. — XXVI, 39, 13 ita in

arto *stipatae* erant naues P, *stipato* R.—XXVII, 43, 9 exercitum urbanum ad narniam *hosti* opponant P², *hostem* R.—XXVIII, 24, 1 prouinciam omnem ac *maxime* longinqua eius turbauit P. Here R has *maxima*, to agree in form with *longinqua*.—XXVIII, 26, 1 per eosdem dies quibus haec *illi* consultabant P, *illis* R. The scribe seems to have had an impression that this pronoun was connected with *quibus*.—XXVIII, 29, 10 exercitus, qui *corona* contionem circumdederat P, *coronam* R.—XXVIII, 31, 6 suam quoque noxam pari *poena* aestimatam rati P, *poenam* R.—XXVIII, 33, 6 neque ex aduerso *tantum* inlati obuios obtriuere P, *tanto* R.—XXIII, 40, 12 ferme III et pcc *capiti* et signa militaria VII et XX P, *capta* R.—XXV, 40, 6 socios ad retinendos in fide animos eorum *ferendoque* in tempore cuique auxilium adit P; *ferendoque* is emended in R to *ferendosque*, that it may agree with *animos*. In all these passages, with the exception of the last, the reading of P was perfectly correct, and the alterations of the scribes were made without any careful consideration of the sense.

Sometimes the case of a noun is altered owing to a failure to understand its real construction, e.g. XXVIII, 25, 4 ad quorum primum aduentum exasperati *animi* P. Ansoaldus has written *animo* in R.—XXVIII, 32, 10 priusquam *prouincia* decedat P, *prouinciam* R. The scribe apparently regarded *decedat* as a transitive verb.—XXVIII, 20, 11 prendere tribuni iuberent, ac iure sacrosanctae *potestatis* reducerent P. The scribe of R, not understanding the construction of *potestatis*, has written *potestates*.—XXVIII, 22, 2 classem in portu simulacrum et ipsam edentem *naualis pugnae* ostendit P, *nauales pugnae* R.—XXVI, 27, 10 *consuli leuino* capuam praetereunti circumfusa multitudo campanorum est P. The scribe of R wrote *consule leuino*, having probably in mind the regular formula for giving a date.—XXV, 40, 3 propter *excellencia* eius generis ornamenta P, *excellentiam* R. Here *excellencia* was not recognized as an adjective.—XXVI, 29, 2 *postmodo* P, changed to *postmodum* in R, owing to the fact that the scribe erroneously

regarded *post* as a preposition. — XXVI, 37, 6 ad *moenia* urbis P², ad *moeniam* urbis R. — XXVIII, 17, 14 nunc *omnis centuriones* militesque . . . *pleminios* fecit P. In this passage the scribe Landemarus did not recognize *omnis* as the accusative plural, and has written: nunc *omnis centurionis* militesque, etc.

(2) Alterations in the forms of verbs. The most common form of this species of emendation consists in changing the number of a verb in order to make it agree with a noun in a different number, which is erroneously supposed to be its subject, or with another verb in a different number.

Examples: XXIII, 22, 3 arma quod impigre *ceperint* laudare P. In R the scribe Fredeğ wrote *ceperit*, which was subsequently altered by a corrector to *coeperint*. — XXV, 40, 1 marcellus . . . cum cetera . . . tanta fide atque integritate composuisset, ut non modo suam gloriam sed etiam maiestatem populi romani *augeret* P, *augerent* R. The scribe was, perhaps, influenced by *composuissent*, the original reading of P¹, which was subsequently corrected to *composuisset*. — XXVI, 6, 4 neque iam armati inrumpentibus romanis resistebant quam quo porta ballistis scorpionibusque instructa missilibus procul hostis *arcebat* P, *arcebant* R. The reading is influenced, perhaps, by the number of *resistebant*. — XXVIII, 23, 4 correpti alii flamma sunt, alii ambusti adflatu vaporis, cum receptus primis urgente turba non *esset* P, *essent* R. The error is possibly due to *sunt* above. — XXVIII, 27, 14 cum eo ipso non contenti, si pro tribunis illos haberetis fascēs imperatoris vestri ad eos quibus seruus cui imperarent numquam *fuerat* romanus exercitus detulisti P, *fuerant* R. — XXVI, 50, 7 amicus populo romano sis et, si me uirum bonum credis esse, qualis patrem patrumque (*sic*) meum iam ante hae gentes norant, *scias* multos nostri similes . . . esse P, *sciant* R.

Sometimes the tenses are changed without any adequate reason for the emendation. *E.g.* XXVIII, 25, 8 *habebat* P, is altered to *habet* in R. — XXVIII, 27, 9 quantum opinio *fefellit* P, *fallit* R. — XXIII, 22, 17 nisi faciet (paci et *Luchs*) concordiae *consulitis* P. The scribe of R has written the future,

consuletis, to agree in tense with the corrupt *faciet*.—XXVI, 31, 7 nec mihi ipsi congresso ad portas cum principibus responsum *dabatur* (*Luchs*). P has here *dabantur*, which is emended in R to *dabuntur*.—XXVIII, 14, 9 id quibus uirtutibus inducti ita *iudicarint* P, *iudicarent* R.—XXVI, 29, 2 quae sors . . . ita exanimauit siculos . . . ut comploratio eorum fleuilesque uoces et extemplo oculos hominum *conuerterint* et postmodo sermones praebuerint P, *conuerterent* R. In these last two examples the reason for the change was, apparently, the unfamiliarity of the scribe with the use of the perfect subjunctive; *praebuerint*, however, was allowed to stand.

The infinitive, especially if it was removed a considerable distance from the word upon which it depended, was not infrequently emended to a finite form of the verb, and the passive infinitive was sometimes carelessly changed to the more familiar active. *E.g.* XXII, 37, 4 quae ne *accipere* abnuant P; *acciperent* is the reading of R, the change being apparently due to the immediate proximity of *ne*.—XXVI, 2, 4 *rescribi* de frumento et uestimentis exercitus placuit P, *rescribit* R.—XXVI, 2, 14 *redisse* P, *redisset* R.—XXVI, 33, 8 *sacrificasse* P, *sacrificasset* R.—XXVIII, 24, 7 si *debellatum* iam et confecta prouincia esset, cur in italiam non *reuehi* P, cur in italiam *reuehit* R (omitting *non*).—XXII, 28, 6 *timeri* P, *timere* R.—XXVIII, 34, 11 *praestari* P, *praestare* R.—In XXVIII, 14, 12 the perf. indic. *acceperere* is altered to *accipere*.—XXVIII, 13, 8 ita enim *iussi* ab senatu erant P, *iussit* R.

(3) Another tendency toward emendation is to be found in the case of unfamiliar words, particularly unusual proper names. Similar words, with which the scribe was more familiar, were often substituted for the unknown word or expression.

Thus, in XXVIII, 26, 4, *indibilem*, the reading of P, is promptly changed in R to *indebilem*.—XXVI, 21, 11 *animaduersum* P, *annum aduersum* R.—XXVIII, 18, 8 *contaminare* P, *contra minare* R.—XXVIII, 33, 9 in *arto* pugna P; in *orto* pugna R, *orto* being the more familiar word.—XXVI, 25, 15 *iamphoryna* P, *iam horina* R. The correctors have also made

emendations of a similar nature. — XXIII, 9, 1 *t. otacilius* P, R¹; *tot acilius* is the emendation of a corrector in R. — XXIII, 9, 4 *noui ali* (= *alii*) *creati t. otacilius*, etc., P, *creavit otacilius* R¹, *creavit tota cilius* corrector. — XXIII, 3, 9 *crotonic tum*, the reading of R¹, being a strange word, is emended to *crotonia tum* by a corrector.

(4) The scribes of R, whose knowledge of the Latin of their own times was far from perfect, naturally found much that was difficult to understand in the Latinity of an author who wrote more than eight hundred years before their day. Expressions of an idiomatic nature, in particular, often proved a stumbling-block to them, and were therefore subject to emendation.

Examples: XXII, 16, 1 *quod uiae* inter bina castra erat P. The scribe of R, not understanding the expression *quod uiae*, emended it to *quot uiae*. — XXVIII, 17, 17 *neque ego exequi possum nec uobis operae est* audire P. Here the use of the genitive was not understood, and the scribe of R wrote *opera est*. — XXVI, 37, 3 *et in italia cum tarentum amissum damno et dolori* . . . fuit P. The dative not being understood, *dolori* was emended in R to *dolore* by a corrector. — XXIII, 3, 15 *locros omnis multitudo abeunt* P. The use of the accusative without a preposition was not understood, and *abeunt* is emended in R to *habent*. — XXVIII, 1, 14 *laelium in africanam praedatum mittit* P; *praedatum* was not recognized as the supine, and was emended in R to *praedatam*, to agree with *africanam*. — XXIII, 16, 19 *in aede libertatis quam pater eius . . . ex multalicia pecunia faciendam curavit* P. A corrector in R, not understanding the construction of *faciendam*, emended it to *facienda*, with the apparent purpose of making it agree with *pecunia*. — XXIII, 10, 2 *ut consules sortirentur* P, *ut consulibus sortirentur* R. — XXVIII, 25, 14 *ad suam cuique* leuandam culpam P; *ad suam cuique* is the emendation of the scribe of R. — XXIII, 8, 2 *eadem uos cura qua in aciem armati descenditis* P; *uos* is omitted in R, probably because the scribe did not understand the order of the words.

(5) The Carolingian scribe, in copying, rarely grasped the meaning of a long sentence as a whole, and was likely in con-

sequence, mentally, to divorce parts of the sentence from the whole, and to alter them to suit some idea suggested to him by the general meaning of the immediate context, or by a neighboring word, without any thought of how such alteration would affect the entire sentence.

An excellent example of this is XXIII, 4, 2 *hiero . . . uoluisse dicitur liberas syracusas relinquere, ne sub dominatu puerili per ludibrium . . . interiret regnum P.* Here Fredeğ, catching the idea of “boy” and “plaything,” has, consciously or unconsciously, emended the words in italics to *pueri liber ludibrium*, supposing the passage to mean, “the book is the boy’s plaything.”—XXIII, 13, 4 *hannibal conlaudatos eos oneratosque ingentibus promissis . . . P.* The same scribe of R, taking his cue from *conlaudatos*, has emended *oneratosque* to *honoratosque*.—XXVIII, 37, 9 *itaque egressi nauibus super portum loco munito castra (locant om. P) ac sine certamine urbe agroque potiti, etc., P.* Influenced by *castra*, *certamine*, and other military expressions, the scribe of R wrote *signe* instead of *sine*.—XXVIII, 17, 9 *aut nos respicietis (respicietis Luchs) perditas res nostras P, recipietis R.*—XXIII, 1, 10 *cum poenus dolo dimissum romanum incusaret, locrenses profugisse ipsum causarentur P; incursaret* is the reading of R, the scribe evidently getting the idea of “attack” from *profugisse*.—XXVI, 41, 10 *quot classes, quot duces, quot exercitus priore bello amissi sunt! iam quid hoc bello memorem? (Luchs).* Here P had *quod* for *quot* in each of the places in which it occurs, and the scribe of R has emended the last part of the sentence to: *iam quod hoc bello memorem.*—XXIII, 1, 9 *ut foedus extemplo aequis legibus feret P.* The scribe of R has emended *feret* to *feret*, apparently with the expression *legem ferre* in mind.

XII. SPELLING AND PRONUNCIATION

In the four centuries which preceded the copying of R great changes had taken place in the pronunciation of Latin. The phonetic changes in the language which developed in Italy

itself, and those which arose in Spain, France, England, and Ireland, in the adaptation of Latin sounds to foreign tongues, were accompanied by corresponding changes in spelling, which varied more or less among the different nationalities (see Schuchardt, *Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins*). Naturally, the Latin texts felt the influence of these changes, and the spelling of the Classical Latin authors became reduced more and more, with every transcription, to the modes of spelling in vogue in the Middle Ages. Laxity of spelling also made it possible for words of different meaning to be confused, and gave rise to errors in the texts. It thus became necessary for the scholars of the last half of the eighth century to establish rules for the writing of such words as might be confused in this way. Of these treatises on spelling the best known is Alcuin's *de Orthographia*.

I have said that Alcuin was abbot of St. Martin's of Tours not more than thirty years before the *Reginensis* was produced in the scriptorium of that monastery. His treatise on orthography was intended, no doubt, for the guidance of scribes engaged in copying Latin manuscripts. It is natural to suppose that its influence would be felt to a greater degree in the scriptorium of his own monastery than anywhere else. We should, therefore, find in the *Reginensis* a practical illustration of the extent to which the treatise influenced the spelling in the texts.

In the *Puteanus* there was already a tendency to use the methods of spelling in vogue in the fifth century, such as *ae* for *e* and *vice versa*, the confusion of *u* and *b*, the omission of the nasals, etc. It can be seen, however, by glancing over a few pages of Luchs's edition, that many of the older forms, such as *aequom*, *aput*, *relicuom*, *obpugnare*, *urps*, etc., are faithfully preserved. In making their copy the scribes of R had three courses open to them: (1) to adhere closely to the spelling of the *Puteanus*; (2) to observe the rules of Alcuin as far as they went; or (3) to use the method of spelling to which the scribe had been accustomed. No one of the eight scribes consistently followed out any one of these three courses. A

given scribe will in one place leave an archaic word unchanged, in another place he changes it to the current mode of spelling. The same word is at one time spelled according to Alcuin's orthography, at another time it is spelled in a different way, by the same scribe. All of the scribes freely introduced the spellings to which they had been accustomed. One is, on the whole, surprised to find that the impression made by Alcuin's treatise was not greater. Its influence does not appear to any extent, except in the work of the scribes Nauto and Gyslarus. For instance, Alcuin directs that the plural of *mille* should be spelled *milia*, but most of the scribes spell it now with one *l*, now with two. With few exceptions, when they departed from the spelling of their original, they adopted the manner of spelling in vogue in their own day. This, too, varied among the different scribes, — a fact which points, no doubt, to local influences, and suggests the probability that they were not all Frankish, but that other parts of western Europe were represented. For instance, Fredeğ, Theogrimnus, Ansoaldus, and Landemarus use *ci* for *ti* indiscriminately, thus: *cerciores*, *sacietatem*, *precia*, *paciendo*, *nunciantes*, *inicium*, *tercius*, *iacencium*, *abrum-pencium*, *spacium*, *arcium* = *artium*, *inficiari*; and *vice versa*, *conditione*, *sozii*, *fatile* = *facile*, *prouintia*, *pretibus* = *precibus*, *supplitio*, *malefitio*, *tenator*. One also finds *iessisset* for *gessisset*, and *agebat* for *aiebat*. This confusion is not so common in the work of the other scribes. Also, Fredeğ and Theogrimnus have a greater tendency than the rest to omit or wrongly to insert the aspirate.

I have already said that, in general, the practice of the scribes of R was to make the archaic forms of their original harmonize with the spellings in vogue in the ninth century. Such forms, for instance, as *aequom*, *haut*, *aput*, etc., were usually written *aequum*, *haud*, *apud*, respectively. Sometimes these archaic forms were left unchanged, and, strangely enough, all of the scribes now and then use the archaic form even when it does not occur in the original. On the page of the facsimile in Chatelain's *Paléographie des Classiques Latins* there happen to

be more than one example of archaizing. To judge from this single page, it might seem as though the tendency to archaize were common;¹ but I have made a collection of the cases in which the scribes had archaized, and found that such archaizing was quite rare and exceptional. I regret that the list is not complete, since I was able to cover not quite two-thirds of the entire manuscript; but it is sufficiently full to show that archaizing the spelling of words was not a common thing among the scribes. The list is as follows:²

XXII, 20, 8 oppugnatā P, obpugnatā R. — XXII, 22, 13 inquit P, inquit R. — XXII, 26, 4 haud P, haut R. — XXII, 29, 3 uelut P, uelud R. — XXIII, 35, 18 neclecta P, neclegta R. — XXIII, 36, 5 oppugnaret P, obpugnaret R. — XXIII, 36, 7 oppugnandae P, obpugnandae R. — XXIII, 49, 5 oppugnabatur P, obpugnabatur R. — XXV, 13, 5 comportatum P, conportatum R. — XXV, 20, 5 imminebat P, inminebat R. — XXVI, 1, 9 supplementum P, subplementum R. — XXVI, 4, 10 apud P, aput R. — XXVI, 25, 2 compulit P, conpulit R. — XXVI, 25, 13 composuerunt P, conposuerunt R. — XXVI, 30, 6 praeoptasse P, praeobtasse R. — XXVI, 30, 7 oppressis P, obpressis R. — XXVI, 37, 9 uelut P, uelud R. — XXVI, 40, 18 uelut P, uelud R. — XXVII, 40, 9 inquit P, inquit R. — XXVIII, 22, 14 suppressit P, subpressit R. — XXVIII, 28, 12 absumptis P, apsumptis R. — XXVIII, 33, 7 imminuti P², inminuti R. — XXVIII, 2, 12 immittendi P, inmittendi R. — XXVIII, 6, 6 redempti P, redemti R. — XXVIII, 6, 8 composuissent P, conposuissent R. — XXVIII, 6, 8 apud P, aput R. — XXVIII, 12, 19 conscripta P, conscribta R. — XXVIII, 13, 8 supplexmentum P, subplexmentum R. — XXVIII, 25, 4 immensum P, inmensum R.

Confusion in spelling is not in R a prolific source of corruption. Naturally, errors can arise only when the altered spelling of one word produces another Latin word, or where

¹ See an article by W. M. Lindsay in the *Classical Review*, 1896, p. 233.

² In the readings of P I have had to rely upon Luchs's silence.

the scribes of R have attempted wrong emendations in the belief that words in the original were wrongly spelled. The following is a list of the confusions in spelling to be found in R. Each case of confusion of letters or sound is followed by a list of errors of which it is the cause.

(1) The confusion of *e*, *ae*, *oe*. This is the most common of all. *ae* and *e*, in particular, are used without discrimination, as, indeed, is also the case in the *Puteanus*. The scribes write *predae* = *praedae*, *aequitum* = *equitum*, *poenatibus* and *paenatibus* = *penatibus*, *praelium*, *saenatum*, *gregae* = *grege*, *caedae* = *caede*, *urbae* = *urbe*, etc.

Examples of possible corruptions due to this cause: XXVI, 34, 2 *operae* praetium P, *opere* praetium R. — XXVI, 15, 10 *infestis signis ire* ad urbem pergit P, *signis irae* R. — XXII, 33, 8 *aedem in arce* faciendam locauerunt P, *arcae* R. — XXIII, 20, 2 *eos effuse* palatos hanno adortus P, *effusae* R. — XXVIII, 25, 6 *suis recte* factis gratia qui exsoluat P, *rectae* R. — XXVI, 49, 15 *nunc ut id curem* impensius, *vestra quoque uirtus dignitasque* facit P, *curae* R. The scribe did not notice the abbreviation for *m*. — XXIII, 49, 12 *suppletis copiis ex prouincia, ut quae maxime* omnium belli cupida P, *prouinci aut quem axime* R¹. The scribe saw *quaem*, and supposed that it was an error in spelling on the part of the scribe of P. — XXVIII, 2, 9 *dum cedenti* duodecimae legioni . . . *tertiam decumam legionem* . . . *firmamentum* ducit P, *caedenti* R. — XXVIII, 30, 6 *cum lelius et ipse* in quinquere mi portu carpeiae . . . *invehitur* P, *ipsae* R. This confusion of *ipse*, *ipsae* is one frequently made by the scribes of R. — XXVIII, 9, 9 *pleminius impotens irae, neglectam* ab scipione . . . *suam iniuriam* ratus P, *iraena et lectam* R. Here the scribe has seemingly resolved the first *e* of *neglectam* into *ae*, and then attached one letter to the first word, and the other to the second. Other examples of this nature have been already given in the chapter on wrong word-division.

As the result of writing *e* for *ae*, *que* is, in manuscripts of all periods, almost as common a spelling of the relative pronoun as

quae. The spelling *que* is, indeed, so common that few errors are likely to arise from it; but, on the other hand, scribes who wished to employ the spelling *quae* for the relative often went too far, and wrote *quae* for the enclitic *que*. This creates an opportunity for corruption, especially if the relative suits the context, and if, as was the case in R, the words were so divided that *quae* was written separately, and not attached to the preceding word. Examples of this kind of error are to be found on every page. I shall give only a few.

XXIII, 1, 7 *aduocataque* extemplo contione P, *aduocata quae* extemplo contione R. — XXVI, 33, 10 *sciretque* (*scisceretque Luchs*) plebs P, *sciret quae* plebs R. — XXVI, 33, 13 *deuina* (= *diuina*) *humanaque*, *utensiliaque* siue quid aliud dederunt P, *utensilia quae* siue R. — XXVII, 39, 6 non enim receperunt modo aruerni eum *deincepsque* aliae gallicae atque alpinæ gentes P, *deinceps quae* aliae R. — XXVIII, 25, 5 *quae* causa ire consternationisque subitæ foret P, *consternationis quae* subitæ R. — XXIII, 39, 7 et nolæ . . . plebs hannibalis erat, *consiliaque* occulta . . . inibantur P, *consilia quae* occulta R. — In XXV, 11, 15 Luchs's text has: *suas . . . cum claustra portus hostis haberet, quem ad modum* inde in apertum mare euasuras. For the words in italics P has: *haberet et que ad modum*. The *et* is probably due to dittography, and the *que* to leaving off the sign for the nasal. The scribe Nauto has added to the difficulty by writing *haberet et quae ad modum*.

(2) *o* written for *u*, and *vice versa*. Spellings such as *tulerantes*, *pupulatione*, *furtuna*, *uicture* (= *uictore*), *ducendo* (= *docendo*), *expugnatoros* (= *expugnatueros*), *incolomi*, *ligorum* (= *ligurum*), *totum* (= *tutum*), *luxoria*, *moros* (= *muros*), *syra-cosanos* are not uncommon. The errors due to this cause consist chiefly in the confusion of the ending *-us* with the ending *-os*, e.g. *maximus* for *maximos*, *medius* for *medios*, *Romanus* for *Romanos*. Errors of this nature have already been treated under Emendation.

(3) Some of the other vowels are confused, though not so frequently.

i is sometimes written for *e*, and *vice versa*, e.g. *diadima* = *diadema*, *luciria* = *Luceria*, *delegestis* = *delegistis*, *itenere* = *itinere*, *uergis* = *uirgis*, *seculorum* = *siculorum*. Spelled *seculorum*, this word is likely to be confused with *saeculorum*.

a and *e* are occasionally confused in unaccented syllables owing to mental pronunciation. Examples are: XXII, 20, 4 *escensio* ab nauibus in terram facta P, *ascensio* R.—XXVI, 51, 3 ipse paucos dies . . . *exercendis* . . . copiis absumpsit P, *exarcendis* R.—XXVII, 41, 5 id modo romanum quaerere *apparebat* P, *apperebat* R. A corrector has changed *apperebat* to *appetebat*.

(4) The wrong insertion or omission of *h*. This creates many possibilities for error, owing to the confusion of such words as *aut*, *haut*; *ac*, *hac*; *iis*, *his* (the correctors in the manuscript have, in almost all cases, changed *iis* to *his*); *ostium*, *hostium*; *anno*, *hanno*; etc. Examples: XXVIII, 19, 8 quae piacula quibus *deis* quibus hostiis fieri placeret P, *de his* quibus R.—XXIII, 13, 4 *hac* cum spe dimissi tarentini P, *ac* cum spe R.—XXII, 24, 6 quia haud dubie hostis brevior uia praeuenturus erat (*Luchs*), *haud quia* dubiae hostibus P, *aut quia* R.—XXIII, 16, 6 metu poenae collem *haut* procul castris ceperunt P, *aut* procul R. This confusion is quite common.—XXIII, 20, 2 eos *effuse palatos* *hanno* adortus P, *effusae palatos anno* R.—XXIII, 14, 1 parte altera *hanno* . . . altera *ti*. gracchus P, parte altera *anno* . . . alterati gracchus R.—XXIII, 40, 8 ad *ostium* fluminis P, ad *hostium* fluminis R.—XXII, 39, 6 *ominis* etiam tibi absit c. flamine memoria P, *hominis* R.—XXVI, 26, 8 dilectum . . . per totam siciliam *habitum* P, *abitum* R.—XXII, 12, 7 et modo citato agmine ex conspectu *abibat* P, *habebat* R.

(5) Final *d* written for final *t*, and *vice versa*. This gives rise to such confusions as *at*, *ad*; *it*, *id*; *quot*, *quod*; *aliquot*, *aliquod*; *idem*, *item*; etc.

Examples of errors due to this cause: XXIII, 39, 13 ipse hibernacula . . . *communiit* aedificauitque P, *communi id* R.—XXIII, 33, 3 iouis *it* (= *id*) templum est P. In R the scribe did not recognize *it* as the other spelling of *id*, and wrote: iouis

sit templum est, which was, however, afterward corrected. — XXVIII, 26, 15 *sedit* tacitus paulisper P, *sed id* tacitus paulisper R. — XXII, 16, 1 *quod uiae* inter bina castra erat P². The scribe of R first wrote *quod*, and then altered so as to read: *quot uiae* inter bina castra erat. — XXII, 34, 10 quia inuitis iis *dictator esset* dictus P, *dictatores sed* R. — XXVIII, 24, 2 quantam excitatura molem *uera fuisset clades* P, *uerafuis sed* clades R. — XXVI, 38, 7 *at* ille . . . rem hannibali aperit P, *ad* ille R. — XXIII, 14, 9 *ad quae clamor cum ingenti adsensu est sublatus* is the reading of the texts. P has: *at quae* clamor, etc. The *at quae* of P has in R become *atque*.

The two errors which follow are due to a similar confusion of *p* and *b*: XXVI, 29, 8 conlege *optionem* dare prouinciae P, *obitionem* dare R. Compare, also, *pueri liber ludibrium* in XXIII, 4, 2, where P has *puerili per ludibrium*.

(6) *b* written for *u*, and *u* for *b*. Spellings such as *uoleuat*, *pleuis* (= *plebis*), occasionally occur, but no corruptions have arisen in R from this cause.

(7) *ci* for *ti* before a vowel, and *vice versa*. This confusion in spelling was so common that few errors were likely to arise from it. I have found but one example of anything amounting to a real corruption from this cause: XXVIII, 12, 1 *neclectae* eo biennio res *in graecia* erant P, *ingratia* erant R.

(8) *i* for *g* before a vowel, and *g* for *i*. XXIII, 35, 4 *aiebat* P, *agebat* R. — XXII, 35, 7 *gessisset* P, *iessisset* R.

(9) The following errors are due to the confusion of the sound of *s* with that of *x*, and that of *c* before *i*: XXVIII, 2, 2 *ausetanum* P, *auxetanum* R. — XVIII, 21, 12 *onus demptum erat de scipione* cognoscendi P, *decipioni* R.

(10) In XXVIII, 29, 5, the texts have *arcessit*, P has *acces-sit*, and R has *accensit*. The error is due to the fact that *n* was not pronounced in the combination *ens*.

(11) The following error seems to be due to a confusion of the sounds of *l* and *r*, which gives rise to the spelling *fraglantia* for *flagrantia*: XXVIII, 28, 10 nihil ultra *facile* creditam mortem meam a nobis uiolatus sim P, *facere* R.

(12) The use of the double letter for the single, and *vice versa*, has already been treated under Dittography and Haplography. This is the cause of confusions such as *dimisi*, *dimissi*; *uELIT*, *uellit*; etc. A good example of an error growing out of the repetition of a single letter is XXV, 41, 10 *ut claudius comitia* perficeret P, *ut claudius commitia* perficeret R. The unusual spelling caused the scribe of M to emend, and write *ut claudius commitius perficeret*.

XIII. MISCELLANEOUS EXAMPLES ILLUSTRATING THE CUMULATIVE GROWTH OF ERROR

The examples given in the preceding pages have been chosen with the view of illustrating, in each case, a single stage of error in the process of transcription. For this purpose I have used, for the most part, only the errors actually made by the scribes who copied the *Reginensis*, disregarding the alterations made by the correctors, who corrected each quaternion as soon as it was finished. These corrections are, however, interesting in themselves, and show how the trifling mistakes of the scribes frequently grew into more serious errors in the superficial attempts of the correctors to make sense of the passages thus affected and to emend the blunders. The *Reginensis*, thus emended, was copied in turn, in the eleventh century, to produce the *Mediceus*, and this manuscript was subsequently corrected by several hands. The *Puteanus* itself had, before the *Reginensis* was copied, received corrections from two correctors, P², P³, in addition to those which were made in the manuscript by the scribe who copied it. Consequently, between the first readings of P, which were sometimes already corrupt, and the last corrections in M, there is sufficient latitude to exhibit several distinct stages in the growth of a corruption. It is the purpose of the following list of examples to illustrate this cumulative growth. Each of the errors here given has, in the hands of the scribes and the correctors of these three manuscripts, passed through at least two stages in the process of corrup-

tion, and some will be found to have passed through as many as five.

The examples are too varied in their nature, and too complicated, to admit of classification. I shall, therefore, arrange them in the order in which they occur in the text. For the present purpose it will not be necessary to distinguish the various hands of the correctors in R. Indeed, the variety of inks used would make it a difficult matter. I shall, therefore, give only the corrections which were already in R before M was copied. In the case of corrections in M, I shall also simply indicate that there was a correction, without specifying whether it was by M², M³, M⁴, etc. The corruptions in the following examples will be studied to better advantage with Luchs's critical edition in hand.

XXII, 28, 3 quem (*Luchs*); queeū P; que | eum R¹; altered to *quae eum* by a corrector.

XXII, 29, 2 proferte (*Luchs*); profere P; profere R¹; altered by a corrector to *proferre*, without regard for the sense.

XXII, 33, 1 qui per biennium *fefellerat*, *Romæ* deprensus (*Luchs*). Here P has *fefellereat romae*, which is written in R as follows, *fefellere at romam*, the scribe understanding the *at* as the preposition *ad*.

XXII, 34, 2 ab Q. Fabio (*Luchs*); abq. fabio P; the scribe of R, not recognizing the *q.* as the abbreviation of *Quintus*, wrote *absque fabio*.

XXIII, 41, 6 deinde aliae *quoque* civitates (*Luchs*); quodq. P, R¹; altered to *quotque* by a corrector in R.

XXIII, 42, 3 ad id tempus *quo tu in Italiam* uenisti (*Luchs*). Here P¹ had *quodu in italiam*, corrected by P² to *quod in italiam*. The scribe of R, disregarding the correction in P, wrote *quod uenit aliam*, which was altered by a corrector to the correction in P.

XXIII, 42, 12 a quo tot acies Romanas fusas stratasque (strataque P, R) esse *sciam*, *ei* facile esse ducam (dicam P, R) opprimere populatores nostros . . . (*Luchs*). By a double

confusion of letters P has in place of *sciam et* the words *suam et*, which were in turn copied into R; but the scribe has altered them to *sua et*, in order to make an apparent agreement with *strataque*.

XXIII, 43, 7 nihil enim Marcellus *ita egerat* (*Luchs*). For the words in italics P¹ had *itagerat*, which was emended to *ita agere at* by P². It was altered still further by the scribe of R, who wrote *itagereuat*, and again, by a corrector, to *ita gerebat*.

XXIII, 46, 4 hostium plus *quinque milia caesa* eo die (*Luchs*). For this P had: hostium *plus uel causa* (altered to *caesa* by P¹, and *caesū* by P³) eo die. The text of R was here worked over to such an extent that the original reading is no longer to be recognized, but, after several alterations and erasures, the passage as it now stands is: hostium *plus uel caesa uel* eo die. The corruption *uel* probably originated in P from a confusion of a numeral and the abbreviation for *milia*, and the correction in R is therefore all the more absurd, the scribe having felt it necessary to add a second *uel*, without any regard for the sense.

XXIII, 47, 6 dicto prope citius equom in uiam *Claudius deiecit* (*Luchs*). Here P has, for the words in italics, *cla|delegit*.¹ This is also the reading of R¹, but a corrector has altered it to *clā delegit*. The whole passage now stands in R as follows: dicto prope citius equum in cauam | uia *clā delegit*. The change to *equum* is by a corrector; but the insertion of *cauam*, from the context a few lines farther on, is by the scribe, who is also responsible for writing *uia*.

XXIII, 49, 2 ut *militia uacarent, dum . . .* (*Luchs*). Here the original reading of P was *mihiia uacarenttum*. The successive stages in the progress of error are as follows: *mihi uacarent tum* P²; *mihi atarent tum* P³; *mihi tarenttum* R¹; *mihi tarentum* corrector in R. The passage now reads in R: unum ut *mihi tarentum* in eo publico essent.

¹ Luchs has here an error in his critical edition, where he reports the reading of P as *cl. delegit*.

XXIII, 49, 3 res publica *administrata est. ii mores*, etc. (*Luchs*).

Here P has *administratast hi mores*. The scribe of R has written: resp. *administratasthimores*, which is corrected by a corrector to: resp. *administratas timores*.

XXIII, 2, 2 ad Crotonem oppugnandam pergunt *ire, Graecam* et ipsam urbem (*Luchs*). By a confusion of letters P has *ire gregā*. In R the scribe Fredeg wrote *ire gregam*. This a corrector then emended to read *ira gregem*. A serious error is, by these various stages, created out of a very simple one.

XXIII, 4, 8-9 funus fit regium magis amore civium et caritate quam *cura suorum celebre. brevi* deinde ceteros tutores summovet Andranodorus (*Luchs*). For the words in italics P has *cura suorum celebrevi deinde*, the syllable *bre* being omitted by haplography. This in turn appears in R as *cur suorum celebrevi deinde*, and has been altered by a corrector to read *cura suorum celebre deinde*. The whole word *brevi* had thus disappeared by degrees.

XXIII, 12, 4 quodque ibi *praesidi* erat P¹; *praesidi* was altered by P² to *praesidiu*, and was thus copied by R¹, but the clause was altered by a corrector so as to read *quoque ibi praesidio erat*.

XXIII, 15, 4 *fortissimus* quisque *pugnator esse* desierat P; *fortissimus* quisque *pugnatores sedesierat* R¹. A corrector in R has written: *fortissimos* quisque *pugnatores sedesierat*, *fortissimus* being altered to agree with *pugnatores*.

XXV, 38, 22 *ite* dis bene iuuantibus P; *iste* dis bene iuuantibus R, M¹. The error is carried through a second stage by a corrector in M, who has corrected *iste* to *ista*.

XXV, 40, 6 huic ab epicyde *et hannone numidae* dati auxiliares P. The words in italics are copied into R thus: *et hanno nenumidae*. The *ne* was not understood, and was consequently omitted by the scribe of M, thus: *et hanno numidae*.

XXV, 40, 13 nam si muttinem opperirentur et secunda *pugnae fortuna evenisset* P. By wrongly spacing the letters of

the last three words, R has written *pugnae fortunae uenisset*, and it was thus copied into M. A corrector, however, has placed a dot over the *e* of *fortunae*, and would read *pugnae fortuna uenisset*.

XXVI, 2, 10 *Cumas Beneventum* aliasque urbes (*Luchs*); *cumas benevolentum* (*beneventum post ras.*) aliasque urbes P. The scribe of R copied the passage as originally written in P, but a corrector has emended it so that it now reads: *cum ad benevolentum* aliasque urbes.

XXVI, 3, 11 *negassentque patres e re publica* esse (*Luchs*); *negassent quae patres e re publica* esse P; *negassent quae patre se rep̄.* esse R¹; *negasset quae patre se rep̄.* esse, corrector in R and M¹. This a corrector in M has emended to: *negasset que utile rep̄.* esse. The passage has thus gone through four stages of corruption, the last of which is a case of wilful emendation unusual for the eleventh century.

XXVI, 5, 6 *nam alia parte ipse adortus est, alia campani omnes* P, R¹. A corrector in R, influenced apparently by the preceding word *alia*, emended to *campania omnes*, and the passage thus emended was copied by the scribe of M; it was further altered by a corrector in M, to read thus: *nam alia parte ipse adortus est, alia campani ac omnes*.

XXVI, 6, 15 *ne tu perditas res Campanorum narras* (*Luchs*). By a confusion of letters the first two words are written *notu* in P, and are thus copied by the scribe of R. A corrector in R has emended the passage to read: *noctu perditas res campanorum narras*.

XXVI, 28, 6 *et Q. Fulvio* Capua prouincia decreta (*Luchs*); *etque fuluio* P, R¹, the abbreviation for *Quintus* and *que* being the same. A corrector in R has emended to *aque fuluio*, and this is copied by the scribe of M. A corrector in M has altered the passage to read: *ac q. fuluio* capua prouincia decreta.

XXVI, 29, 8 *conlege* (= *conlegae*) *optionem* P; *conlegae obtionem* R; *conlegae obitionem* M¹. This error, now corrected in M, is due to the archaizing of spelling unusual in R.

- XXVI, 30, 11 cum *excedere ex templo* . . . Laeinus iussisset (*Luchs*); *excedere et templo* P¹ (corrected by P²); *excederet extemplo* R¹; *excederet extimplo* corrector in R, and M¹; now emended in M to *excedere extemplo*.
- XXVI, 35, 2 nec, *ex qua* pararentur stipendiumque acciperent (*Luchs*); *ex aquam* (quam P²) P¹, R¹; the scribe of M has altered the case of *aquam* to agree with *ex*, and has written: nec *ex aqua* pararentur.
- XXVI, 36, 2 sicut honore *praestent ita* (ex *tita* P¹) ad omnia P; *praestēt tita* R¹; *praestetit ita* corrector in R; *prestitit ita* M.
- XXVI, 36, 4 nobismet ipsis *primum imperemus* (*Luchs*); *primum peremus* P, R; *primum feremus* corrector in R.
- XXVI, 36, 6 *ut salinum* patellamque deorum causa habere possint (*Luchs*); *ut alinum* P¹; *ut alignum* P², R¹; *ut lignum* corrector in R, also M.
- XXVI, 39, 10 tarentini *ut recuperata urbe* ab romanis post centesimum prope annum arcem etiam liberarent P; *ut recuperat urbe* R; *ut recuperaret urbe* M¹; *ut recuperaret urbem* corrector in M,—a good example of superficial emendation.
- XXVI, 39, 12 ut non missilibus tantum sed gladiis etiam prope conlato pede *gereretur res* (*Luchs*); *quereretur* P; *quaeretur* R.
- XXVI, 39, 18 mox praedae *fuere Thurinis* Metapontinisque. ex onerariis, *quae cum commeatu sequebantur* . . . (*Luchs*); mox praede *fuere thurinīs* metapontinisque ex onerariis *que cum meatu sequabantur* P; mox praede *fuere* (*fuere* corrector) *hurinis* meta pontinisque ex honerariis *que cum meatus equabantur* R.
- XXVI, 40, 9 et cum agmine iam in media urbis ac forum magno *tumultu iretur* P; *tumultui retur* R; *tumultu retur* M¹; *tumultuaretur* corrector in M.
- XXVI, 40, 9 ratus *Hanno nihil aliud* quam tumultum ac secessionem (*Luchs*); *hannonaliud* P, R¹; *hanno. n. aliud* corrector in R; *hannonē aliud* M.

- XXVI, 40, 17 per latrocinia *ac* rapinam tolerantēs uitam (*Luchs*); latrocinia *at* rapinam P; latrocinia *ad* rapinam R.
- XXVI, 41, 13 nullum iam nomen *esset* populi Romani (*Luchs*); *set* P; *sed* R, M.
- XXVI, 51, 6 remigium *classicique milites* tranquillo in altum euecti P; *clausicique milites* R¹. The error of the scribe, which was apparently purely accidental, has grown into a serious corruption in the attempt at emendation on the part of a corrector. The passage now reads: remigium *clausi civesque* milites, etc.
- XXVI, 51, 7 haec extra urbem terra marique corpora simul animosque ad bellum *acuebant*; *urbs ipsa* strepebat, etc. (*Luchs*); *acuebant urp. sipsa* P; *acuebantur p̄. sipsa* R¹; *acuebantur p̄. ipsa*, after erasure.
- XXVII, 42, 1 itaque excitus tumultu raptim ad hostem *copias* agit (*Luchs*). By a confusion of letters P has *coptas*; this a corrector in R altered to *captas*, but the correction is now erased.
- XXVIII, 26, 12 ut ultro *territuri* succlamationibus (*Luchs*); *ferrituri* P; *ferituri* R.
- XXVIII, 27, 11 ut *uenti et* aurae cient (*Luchs*); *et ueni et* P¹; *et uenti et* P²; *et ueniet aurae* R¹; *et uenietes* (= uenientes) *aurae* corrector in R.
- XXVIII, 1, 20 eum superesse unum ducem Romanis ceteris ab Hannibale *interfectis rebatur* (*Luchs*); *interfectis rebantur* P, R¹; this a corrector in R has wilfully emended to *interficiebantur*.
- XXVIII, 7, 5 cum equitibus Numidis *circumequitabat* urbem (*Luchs*); *circumequitib.* | *at* P¹; *circumequitat* P²; *circumeat* R¹ (now corrected to the reading of P²).
- XXVIII, 8, 11 tum quoque alio genere cladis eadem illa pecunia omnibus *contactis ea uiolatione* templi furorem obiecit (*Luchs*). By the confusion of the letters *t* and *i*, P has *contactis ea utulatione*. R¹ wrote *contracti se autulatione*, which has been altered by a corrector to *contracti se adulatione*.

XXVIII, 14, 14 *populus frequens dona deae in Palatium tulit, lectisterniumque et ludi fuere, Megalensia appellata (Luchs); magalesia appellata P; megalesi iam appellata R.*

From the above examples it can be seen that these successive tamperings with what was originally but a slight corruption have occasionally led, in the end, to the restoration of the original reading; more frequently, however, they have led farther and farther away from it, so that, by the time a given corruption has passed through the hands of the corrector of the eleventh-century M, it may be beyond the reach of purely palaeographical restoration, and can only be emended by plunging boldly into the realm of conjecture, which may meet with as much or as little success, in restoring the actual words of the author, as the efforts of the various correctors in P, R, and M have had. These various attempts at emendation are for the most part superficial, and few of them are extensive, but they gradually accumulate into corruptions of considerable proportions, whose cumulative growth points pretty clearly to one of the reasons for the corrupt condition of manuscripts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

[*Concluded.*]

F. W. SHIPLEY.